REMARKS

Claims 6, and 8 to 27 are pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment herein places this application in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

<u>Citation of GB 2,300,062</u>

GB 2,300,062 ("Phillips") has been cited against the claims in support of the rejections thereof. However, this reference is not listed on the PTO-form 892 provided by the Examiner. Nor was it listed on the PTO-form 1449 provided by applicant. It is respectfully requested that a PTO-form 892 listing this reference be provided to applicant with the next Office Action.

Amendments to the Drawings

As required by the Office Action, a replacement sheet containing an amended Fig. 1 is submitted herewith. The amended Fig. 1 depicts a hinge H, an axis A around which the doorframe rotates and an arrow R which illustrates the rotation around axis A. It is respectfully submitted that the drawing is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.121(d).

Amendment to the Specification

The specification is amended herein to conform to the amended Fig. 1. Moreover clerical errors are corrected to properly identify the numeral indicators for the display means. It is

Appln. No.: 10/575,387 Page 15

Reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008

respectfully submitted no new matter is introduced by any of the amendments herein. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

The Rejections under Prior Art

1. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 2,326,505 ("Palmer"). Palmer is directed to a gaming machine.

Claim 27 cites in relevant part that the two display monitors 28a and 28b are securely affixed to the doorframe 15. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Palmer.

Referring to Palmer page 3, lines 17 to page 4 line 6, and to page 4, lines 14-16 and page 8, lines 8-9 of Palmer, the Examiner asserts that Palmer teaches that the display monitors are securely affixed to the doorframe. However, what Palmer states in these passages does not support such an interpretation. What Palmer states is as follows:

The control system of the invention may be used with any suitable kind or construction of entertainment machine. Most preferably, however, the machine has a cabinet with a main body part and a front wall structure comprising a mounted display panel with at least one said peripheral device associated therewith, which front wall structure can be moved relative to the said body part to open the cabinet for access to the interior thereof, whereby the (or at least one) said serial bus extends within the cabinet between the control unit mounted in the body part and the (or each) said peripheral device associated with the said display panel.

With this arrangement, the control system of the invention can be particularly advantageous. It is common practice to associate multiple peripheral devices with front panels of entertainment machines and the minimised cabling arrangement of the invention facilitates installation in this context.

Palmer, page 4, lines 14-16 states:

Appln. No.: 10/575,387 Page 16

Reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008

The front wall structure may be movably mounted via a hinge joint or the like and gas or hydraulic struts, or detachable fixed struts or the like may be provided to hold the wall structure temporarily in its open position.

Palmer, page 8, lines 8-11 states:

Also in the upper part 9 of the cabinet 1 behind the upper panel 11 there is mounted a display unit 27 comprising a bank of lamps 28, behind a printed track of a feature game. The bank of lamps 28 is fixed between the side walls 3.

Palmer does not disclose display monitors <u>affixed</u> to the doorframe. Palmer discloses flat glass panels 12 on the door. However, these are windows, <u>not</u> display monitors, and define window areas 19, 20. Palmer discloses peripheral devices associated with the front panel. However, the only such devices disclosed are press buttons 31 and slot 32. The lamps 28 are disclosed as being behind the upper panel 11. However, these lamps are fixed between the side walls 3 and therefore <u>cannot</u> be affixed also to the front door. In fact, Palmer explicitly states that all components 27-35 are separate from the front wall structure 7 to permit its opening (Palmer, page 8, lines 20-22). Accordingly, Palmer does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of the present independent claim 27. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 6 and 8-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Palmer in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0277477 ("Hajder et al.").

Claim 6 is amended herein to recite, <u>inter alia</u>, that the display monitors are fixedly attached to the doorframe is supported on the gaming machine cabinet by a substantially vertical hinge.

Palmer neither discloses nor suggests display monitors attached to the doorframe. Nor does Palmer disclose or suggest that the doorframe is mounted to the cabinet by a vertical hinge which allows the doorframe to rotate between open and closed positions.

Hajder et al. discloses an upright cabinet with a front door opening around a vertical axis. (Figs. 2, 7, 8). However, there is no disclosure in Hajder, et al. of display monitors fixedly attached to the doorframe 43. Hajder et al. does disclose video displays 26 which rotate away from the doorframe to allow viewing by a technician. (See, e.g., paragraph [0049] of Hajder et al.). However, the displays 26 are not fixedly attached to the doorframe.

Whether taken individually or in combination, Palmer and Hajder et al. do not disclose or suggest the invention of claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 and all claims depending therefrom are submitted to be allowable.

Claim 8 is amended to recite that at least one of the two display monitors 28a and 28b is a cathode ray tube monitor. Such monitors are typically bulky and heavy and would not be fixedly attached to an upwardly opening door frame such as that of Palmer. Nor does Hajder et al. disclose cathode ray tube monitors attached to a horizontally pivoting door frame. Accordingly, claim 8 is even further distinguishable over the art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 8-24 are respectfully requested. Appln. No.: 10/575,387 Page 18

Reply to the Office Action of July 25, 2008

New claim 28

New claim 28 depends from claim 27 and further specifies that at least one display monitor is a cathode ray tube monitor. This recitation further distinguishes the claim over the prior art, as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above all of the pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance, the same being respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

Adrian T. Calderone Reg. No. 31,746

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 1000 Woodbury Road, Suite 405 Woodbury, New York 11797

Tel: (516) 228-8484 Fax: (516) 228-8516